

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 10 2006

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: MICHAEL WINKLER - 2 EXAMINER: B. MUSSER  
SERIAL NO.: 10/724,936 GROUP: 1733  
FILED: DECEMBER 1, 2003  
TITLE: METHOD AND DEVICE FOR PRODUCING TAPES IN PAIRS FOR THE  
MANUFACTURE OF CLOSING TAPES FOR DIAPERS

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENTS

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated December 13, 2005,  
with the time for response being one month, or until January 13,  
2006, Applicant respectfully responds as follows:

The Patent Examiner has required a selection of one of the  
following groups for further prosecution:

- Group I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a method of producing  
tapes in pairs, classified in class 156,  
subclass 227.
- Group II. Claims 9-16, drawn to an apparatus for  
creating closing tapes, classified in class  
156, subclass 443.

## ELECTION:

The Applicant respectfully elects with traverse Group I, claims 1-8, drawn to a method of producing tapes in pairs for further prosecution.

It is believed that the present invention is directed to a unitary inventive concept, namely, a method and an apparatus for producing tapes in pairs. It is believed that any search for the species embodied in Group I would necessarily include a search for the species embodied in Group II. Thus, a simultaneous search for both groups is believed not to constitute an unreasonable search for the Patent Examiner.


In addition, it is believed that the objectives of streamlined examination and compact prosecution would be promoted if a search were conducted simultaneously for both groups. Also, the necessity of filing multiple patent applications for the same invention does not serve to promote the public interest. This is because of the extra expense that is involved, in filing fees and examination costs, as well as the burden upon the public due to the necessity of searching through a multiplicity of patent files in order to find the complete range of subject matter claimed in several different patents that could otherwise be found in one issued patent only.

Applicant reserves the right to file a divisional patent application for the non-elected claims.

For all these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the Requirement for Restriction under 35 U.S.C. §121 be withdrawn. An action on the merits of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Michael WINKLER - 2

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.  
1077 Northern Boulevard  
Roslyn, New York 11576  
(516) 365-9802  
WCC:ea

  
Allison C. Collard, Reg. No. 22,532  
Edward R. Freedman, Reg. No. 26,048  
William C. Collard, Reg. No. 38,411

**FACSIMILE CERTIFICATION**

Fax No. 571-273-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by facsimile transmission to the U.S.P.T.O. to Patent Examiner B. Musser at Group No. 1733, to 1-571-273-8300 on January 10, 2006.

  
William C. Collard

R:\Patent\W\W\WINKLER, M.-2\Restriction Response.wpd